

Minutes  
Board Meeting  
Thursday, December 17, and Friday, December 18, 1998

Board of Registration for Professional Engineers  
And Land Surveyors

Board Office—3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Conference Room  
2535 Capitol Oaks Drive  
Sacramento, CA

**Thursday, December 17, 1998**

**1. ROLL CALL TO ESTABLISH QUORUM**

The meeting was called to order by President Powell at 3:00 p.m.

Roll call was taken—a quorum was present.

Board Members Present: Myrna Powell (President), George Shambeck (Vice-President), Gregg Brandow, David Chen, Vince DiTomaso, Ted Fairfield, Jim Foley, Kathy Hoffman, Andrew Hopwood, Stephen Lazarian, Marilyn Lyon, Millicent Safran, Quang Vu

Board Staff Present: Cindi Christenson (Executive Officer), Gary Duke (Legal Counsel), Susan Ruff (Legal Counsel), Kevin A. Schunke (Special Assistant to the Executive Officer), Nancy Eissler (Attorney General Liaison Analyst), Robert Jones (Board Administrative Assistant), Joanne Arnold (Enforcement/Legislative Program Manager)

Board Members Absent: None

Public Present: Tom Stout, representing himself; Joyce Hirano, Caltrans; John Beck, PG&E; Richard Foltz, representing himself; Bill Winter, CA Cable T.V. Association; Rich Ray, CLSA; Roger Poynts, UDI-Tetrad; Christina Chen, representing herself; Marti Kramer, CSPE

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

President Powell asked for public comment. There was none.

The Board went into Closed Session.

The meeting was adjourned immediately following Closed Session, at 3:15 p.m.

**Friday, December 18, 1998**

**1. ROLL CALL TO ESTABLISH QUORUM**

The meeting was called to order by President Powell at 9:00 a.m.

Roll call was taken—a quorum was present

Board Members Present: Myrna Powell (President), George Shambeck (Vice-President), Gregg Brandow, David Chen, Vince DiTomaso, Ted Fairfield, Jim Foley, Kathy Hoffman, Andrew Hopwood, Marilyn Lyon, Millicent Safran, Quang Vu

Board Staff Present: Cindi Christenson (Executive Officer), Gary Duke (Legal Counsel), Susan Ruff (Legal Counsel), Kevin A. Schunke (Special Assistant to the Executive Officer), Nancy Eissler (Attorney General Liaison Analyst), Robert Jones (Board Administrative Assistant), Joanne Arnold (Enforcement/Legislative Program Manager)

Board Members Absent: Stephen Lazarian

Public Present: See Attachment A.

President Powell introduced and welcomed Dr. David Chen, recently appointed Public member, to the Board.

**2. PUBLIC COMMENT FOR ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

None

The Board went into Closed Session.

**4. OPEN SESSION TO ANNOUNCE RESULTS OF CLOSED SESSION**

The Board approved the recommendation of the Enforcement Committee to adopt the proposed stipulation in the matter of Earl McGuire.

The Board took action on the petition for reconsideration of Ladislav Peter Petrovsky.

The Board adopted the passing raw cutscores of the following examinations given at the October 1998 test administration: Quality, 99 out of 147, Corrosion, 89 out of 145, and Safety, 104 out of 149 points possible.

The Board approved for registration an individual Civil examinee who had previously passed the 8-hour portion of the Civil, has now passed the Seismic Principles and Engineering Surveying examination and has—once notified of his deficiency—returned and passed his take-home examination.

The Board discussed pending litigation as noticed.

## **5. APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS**

MOTION: Mr. Vu/Mr. Hopwood moved to approve the Minutes of the November 5 & 6, 1998, Board Meeting; the Three and/or Five Year Delinquents; and the Examination Procedures and Results considered in Closed Session.

VOTE: 12-0, Motion carried.

## **6. COMITY AND TEMPORARY AUTHORIZATION APPLICATIONS**

MOTION: Mr. Fairfield/Mr. Shambeck moved to approve the applicants for registration by Comity.

VOTE: 12-0, Motion carried.

## **7. UTILITY DEREGULATION—PRESENTATION BY RANDY HOWARD (POSSIBLE ACTION)**

Due to weather conditions Mr. Howard was unable to attend the meeting. This item was postponed until the February 1999 Board meeting.

## **8. LITTLE HOOVER COMMISSION REPORT: CONSUMER PROTECTION**

Ms. Christenson briefed the Board on the position statements drafted in response to the four recommendations contained in the executive summary portion of the Little Hoover Commission Report (the Report).

After discussion, the Board agreed that policies need to be adopted in response to the Report. A sub-committee comprised of George Shambeck and Kathy Hoffman was formed to work with staff on development of the responses to the Little Hoover Commission's four recommendations.

**9. REPORT ON DECEMBER 2, 1998, PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR FOCUS GROUP MEETING**

Ms. Christenson briefed the Board on the Professional Land Surveyor Focus Group Meeting, summarizing what the group felt were some of the contributing factors to the low pass rate in 1998. Ms. Christenson noted a misstatement in facilitator Susan Cowan-Scott's memorandum, "...at the conclusion of the meeting, all agreed that the low 1998 pass rate was a fluke." Ms. Christenson pointed out that only one or two individuals at the meeting said that the low pass rate *could have been* a fluke.

Vice President Shambeck stated that in attempting to be responsive to the input from the focus group, the next step in the exam process will be to go to field testing. In field testing, an exam is assembled by a psychometrician with certain items from the exam item pool. Items selected are also measured against a test plan. Then, this exam will be administered during the field test in January 1999 to four recently licensed (within the last 1-5 years) surveyors. The exam is taken as it is proposed to be administered in April of 1999. The examinees then comment on the length of time required to complete the exam, the exam's difficulty, and their ability to comprehend items included in the exam.

Vice President Shambeck also reported that, as a result of input from the focus group, this year there are 12 field testers to work on the exam instead of four. There had been some concern that the right information was not being gathered from just the four field testers. Vice President Shambeck commented that with more field testers, the better the work will likely be on two particular items: the length of time to complete the exam, and the complexity of the items being written and used on the exam.

Vice President Shambeck also stated that the Board had been asked to release some of the exam questions and their grading plans. After Mr. Fairfield shared his concerns about releasing or publishing actual exam questions, Mr. Shambeck stressed to the Board that there is absolutely no intention of doing so. Instead, the Board will use items from the actual exam to develop prototype questions and prototype grading plans so people can see the process of how we develop exam questions and grading plans.

Vice President Shambeck reported that in developing the Land Surveyor exam, the Board would also be looking more and more at statistics. He referred to the spreadsheet handout which tabulates, over the past five years: the total number of applicants, how many passed/failed, the level of education, years of experience, types of work experience, number of registered civil engineers taking the exam,

and number of times exam taken. Vice President Shambeck stated that the Board would attempt to keep up on the statistics in the future to keep a rolling five-year format.

President Powell also reported her thoughts on the focus group. One thing missing which was discussed at length was the preparation of the applicant. Some of the questions explored: Did examinees have broad-based experience? Was there a lack of thorough review? Did they just not study hard and/or take the exam seriously enough?

President Powell added that at the February Board meeting, Ms. Christenson would be presenting an overview of the exam process.

Ms. Christenson directed the Board's attention to a handout of the CLSA survey questionnaire of the PLS candidates. Mentioning the good job that CLSA did, Ms. Christenson pointed out some of the statistics from the summary portion of the questionnaire.

Mr. Fairfield commented on his belief that the PLS exam is too lengthy. He mentioned similar comments fielded some years ago about the Special Civil examination. Mr. Fairfield, Mr. Brandow and Ms. Christenson and others working on the Special Civil examination at the time decided to add ½ hour to the allowable time to complete parts of the exam. "Magically," the exam results in Special Civil stabilized thereafter. Sometimes it's harder than it seems, Mr. Fairfield stated, to complete a P.E. exam in the allotted time.

Mr. Brandow added that it is always true when an exam is written that it seems like a person should be able to complete an exam in a shorter time than he or she actually can. A lot of time is spent digesting a problem before a problem is started and an examinee might go astray and have to back up. Mr. Brandow stated that time should be allotted for this.

Ms. Christenson introduced Mr. Rich Foltz, who participated in the focus group.

#### **10. JOINT UTILITY TRENCH DESIGN PRESENTATION BY SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON (POSSIBLE ACTION)**

Due to weather conditions the group was unable to attend the meeting. This item was postponed until the February 1999 Board meeting.

President Powell appointed Mr. Foley and Ms. Hoffman to work with staff and industry persons and report to the Board.

#### **11. TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS**

##### **a. Land Surveying**

- No Meeting Held
- b. **Civil/Geotechnical Engineering**
  - No Meeting Held
- c. **Electrical Engineering**
  - No Meeting Held
- d. **Mechanical Engineering**
  1. Report on the December 8, 1998, Committee Meeting.

Mr. Vu reported on the December 8, 1998, Committee Meeting.

Mr. Vu stated that at the meeting was Lyle Wilutz, Chairman of the Academy of Electrical Engineers with CELSOC. Mr. Wilutz provided input on the draft definition of mechanical engineering.

The ME TAC came up with a 5-phase plan for drafting a definition which includes joint work with the EE TAC. Phase 1 is to prepare a list of reasons for changing the definition. Phase 2 is the ME and EE TACs preparing jointly proposed wording for a definition of mechanical and electrical engineering. Phase 3 is to preview the proposed definition and survey the acceptance of it among the professional societies and trade organizations and to put together the comments received. Phase 4 is to request accepting resolutions from those organizations. Phase 5 is to prepare a final resolution and to present it to the full Board for acceptance.

Mr. Vu suggested that the design-build questionnaire results should be passed on to all TACs for their comments; President Powell requested that this be done.

Mr. Vu also mentioned that there was discussion by the ME TAC of the currently-dead but likely to be revived bill SB 2069.

Mr. Vu mentioned the upcoming expiration date for the two outgoing ME TAC members. The TAC is going to send out requests for applications in the next few months, replacing the two outgoing members by the end of June 1999. The TAC will also be accepting applications for three other TAC positions due to expire in 1999.

The Board discussed why revised draft definitions are or will be attempted for the mechanical, electrical and structural branches of engineering. The main reason is that the current definitions have been around for a long time and are outdated and need to be made current.

- e. **Structural Engineering**
  1. Report on the December 16, 1998, Committee Meeting.

Mr. Brandow reported on the December 16, 1998, Committee Meeting.

2. Temporary and Fixed Structures (Possible Action)

Mr. Brandow reported that this item was assigned as a ‘homework’ problem for the SE TAC to go back to try to decipher or come up with a definition or expand the current definition of what temporary and fixed structures are.

3. Definition “Periodic Observation” for Board Rule 404(gg)  
(Possible Action)

This item is to be put on the next agenda.

4. 1997 Uniform Building Code (Possible Action)

Mr. Brandow reported that the TAC recommended the use of the 1994 Uniform Building Code (UBC) and the 1995 California Building Code on the next Structural exam rather than jumping ahead to the 1997 UBC. The 1997 UBC is just too new. The TAC will carefully write instructions and directions for the Structural examination, as both the 1994 and 1997 UBC’s are currently used in practice.

5. Structural Engineering Applicant Qualifying Experience for  
Examination (Possible Action)

There was discussion but no action taken.

**12. LIAISON REPORTS**

a. ABET

President Powell directed the Board’s attention to the handouts summarizing two recent ABET accreditations, one at UC Riverside—which President Powell herself attended--and one at Santa Clara University attended by staff Civil Engineer Eileen Crawford.

b. NCEES (Possible Action)

- 1999 Western Zone Meeting

Mr. Shambeck asked that this item be taken out of order so that all Board members could hear his report.

- Examination Policy 13.A (EP13)

Ms. Christenson referred to the memorandum from the NCEES on page 52 of the agenda which states, “Until the recommendations are presented and the matter is reconsidered in August 1999, the NCEES advises your Member Board not to implement or take any action relative to EP13.”

Mr. Fairfield commented that there was concurrence at the NCEES Board of Directors (BOD) meetings that the letter drafted by the California Board in opposition to the implementation of EP13 was an excellent commentary on the issues.

- NABER Agreement

Ms. Christenson reported on the draft agreement and the recommendation to renew it for three more years.

Mr. Fairfield, speaking as an NCEES Board member and not lobbying for or against the contract, made several comments. He stated that this draft represents a positive change from past practice by NCEES in that the Member Boards are allowed to see a draft before it being put into practice. Mr. Fairfield also pointed out that several portions of the agreement were inserted due to strong lobbying, including the sentence, “The NCEES and the NABER(S) both understand and acknowledge that licensure of engineers within the United States is within the purview of and controlled by the statutes and licensing boards of the individual states, district and territories of the United States.”

Although Mr. Fairfield was unable to convince the BOD to delete the words “substantial equivalency of their examination standards,” he was able to help get a sentence added at the end of number (2) on the bottom of page 54 of the agenda as follows: “Notwithstanding the above, nothing herein shall be construed to assure or mandate comity or reciprocal rights to practice in either country or recognition by NABER(S) or by the individual Member Boards of the states, district and territories of the United States.”

Also added on to the agreement at the end of number (3) on page 55, was “Allocation of expenses will be in conformance with the financial policies of the NCEES.” This statement means that events such as, for example, the Chinese delegation’s NCEES-funded visit to the California exam site and subsequent visits to Disneyland and Universal Studios, are to be carried out at no net cost to the Council.

MOTION: Mr. Hopwood/Mr. Foley moved to fill out and send in the draft agreement with NABER survey to the NCEES with the following changes (page 56):

**This board has indicated that it ~~supports the ideals of the NCEES Strategic Plan and concurs with the NCEES Board of Directors that this draft agreement conforms with the Strategic Plan and NCEES policy.~~**

VOTE: 11-1, Motion carried. Ms. Safran voted ‘nay.’

- 1997-98 Fiscal Year Financial Statements



Mr. Fairfield gave his NCEES liaison report at this point. He pointed out that the NCEES 1998-99 budget adopted in August knowingly contained a budget deficit, probably by several hundred thousand dollars. However, thanks to a bunch of things initiated by then-president Steve Schenk last year, there may be no more budget deficit by the end of this fiscal year. Also, there is a \$130,000 increase in exam revenue beyond budget already in this fiscal year.

Mr. Fairfield also brought up for Board consideration a question about surveying degrees being issued via the Internet. Mr. Fairfield suggested that some kind of questionnaire would be appropriate to send out to California colleges and also suggested that some kind of policy may need to be developed by this Board as to whether or not we would recognize such a degree.

President Powell asked staff to develop a survey to send out to California colleges asking if they are going toward the use of Internet courses in engineering. Staff is to report the results of the survey back to the Board.

Mr. Fairfield commented on the NCEES BOD meeting.

Mr. Fairfield commented on the status of the Computer Based Testing (CBT) task force converting to computer testing. There is no commitment to move ahead with any such contract unless it is a complete “slam dunk.”

- c. International Relations (Possible Action)
  - Mobility of Engineers within Canada

Ms. Christenson brought to the Board’s attention the letter written for the Board in opposition to the Agreement on Mobility of Professional Engineers within Canada. The letter was put into the agenda as an informational item only.

- d. Technical and Professional Societies

No report

- b. NCEES (Possible Action)
  - 1999 Western Zone Meeting

Mr. Shambeck reported on the 1999 NCEES Western Zone Meeting to be held in Monterey, California, on April 29, 30, and May 1, 1999.

Mr. Shambeck gave a brief overview of the NCEES Zone rotations and how 1999 happens to be California’s year to host a Western Zone Meeting.

He reminded the Board that we still have to solicit funds in the amount of \$20,000.00 out of the total \$45,000.00 cost. Currently, we have about \$4,000.00

of the amount solicited. Professional Engineers in California Government (PECG) has promised an in-kind contribution to underwrite a portion of the event. They have put aside approximately \$2,000.00. PECG will also give mugs to every person in attendance.

The Western Zone committee has put together solicitation letters to be sent to professional societies, other engineers and surveyors, or friends who might be interested in contributing to and supporting the event. For any members of the Board who want copies, Kevin Schunke has the letter and a mailing list of those it has already been sent to.

It was suggested that the Western Zone meeting could be mentioned in our Bulletin in an effort to get donations from registered California engineers towards the NCEES costs for the event. Ms. Christenson informed the Board that the Bulletin had just been sent out, so we would have to send a suggested article to the professional societies instead.

### **13. PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

President Powell complimented Ms. Christenson, staff and the Board members who had met with professional groups regarding concerns with what the Board is doing or should be doing. Just by listening to and answering questions, the Board can continue to show our dedication and acceptance of responsibility and can share the legal limitations we face.

President Powell also discussed the three-day NCEES Governance Committee meetings she attended in Baltimore, Maryland. Among the questions asked of President Powell by the Committee was: What has gone wrong with the Council? President Powell shared some answers she gave: poor communication by the Board of Directors, too many changes too soon, and a perception of control by the few are contributing factors.

President Powell remains cautiously optimistic about the NCEES after the two days of meetings with the Governance Committee. She reported that there would be no changes to the zone rotations until after four more rotations. Some things that could be changed are that the nominating committee will be elected instead of appointed. The Board of Directors could consist of the president, president-elect, past president, the four zone vice presidents, plus two at-large vice presidents. There could also be fewer standing committees. Special committees would be formed as needed and will, in time, be more limited. Networking groups would be encouraged.

Also, "one state, one vote" would be the recommended voting procedure. However, any changes to the NCEES constitution or by-laws must have 2/3 acceptance of member boards either present or by proxy at the Annual Meeting.

Thus, states with multiple Boards may control the vote. Fine-tuning of the recommendations will continue.

President Powell stated she believes the Council was heard. Our various response letters to the Council were read and commented upon. We should keep it up!

President Powell commented that the Sunset hearings are still ahead of us. As Joanne Arnold reported, it is now mostly a matter of waiting to see who the 'players' are. We need the support of the various associations and consumer groups.

A big focus for the Board and staff will now be the 1999 Western Zone Conference. President Powell reminded the Board to please support Mr. Shambeck in his efforts to raise funds for the Conference. We are not only hosting the conference, but will be there to support Mr. Fairfield as he chairs as the zone Vice President. All Board members should expect to attend this fun and informative event.

President Powell also reported that the April 8 & 9, 1999 Board meetings would be held at the Board Office instead of the Chico area. In February, there will be a presentation about the Board's examination processes. Also in April, the Enforcement Unit will explain their operating procedures.

#### **14. EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**

Ms. Christenson referred to the Executive Summary report where it was broken out, as requested by Mr. Hopwood, to exam applications and comity applications as far as what we have received this month versus what we received last year. The number of applications has increased about 25%, with big increases in Civil and EIT applications.

Ms. Christenson reported on the status of the Internet license look-up project.

Ms. Christenson reported on new hires and vacancies. Trish Wade, a former Board employee, was re-hired by the Board and is getting applications out. LaWonda Alexander was moved to the reception area and Tiffany Criswell was moved from the reception area to do Technical Advisory Committee member travel claims. Also, Cady Davis has been working in the Enforcement Unit one day a week and has already closed a couple of cases.

Ms. Christenson stated that she would put off reporting on the Cite and Fine program until the next Board meeting when some of the issues will be brought up before the Board. Ms. Christenson did mention that higher fines were being imposed based on the nature and severity of the action.

Ms. Christenson reported on examinations. She stated that the October 1998 Structural Engineering exam grading session was done for the first time via

computers. Ms. Christenson said that it was a marathon session, lasting 6 days. It took a while for the calibration process to get going, extending the session an extra few days. Also, there were only 60 graders instead of the planned 90 graders which added to the length of the process.

Ms. Christenson reported on publications. She stated that the Fall Bulletin had just been published and mailed out. *The Guide to Engineering and Land Surveying for City and County Officials* just went through its third printing and has been quite popular.

Ms. Christenson gave the DCA update. She reported on the SEAOC practice act proposal.

Ms. Christenson reported on the input we have been receiving about some of our Board Policy Resolutions.

## **15. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **a. Legislative**

1. Report on the December 17, 1998, Committee Meeting

Mr. Hopwood reported on the December 17, 1998, Legislative Committee Meeting.

2. Legislation for the 1999/2000 Legislative Session (Possible Action)

Mr. Hopwood reported on the CLSA presentation and that, with the help of Mr. Shambeck and Gary Duke, the CLSA would come up with mutually acceptable language for legislation which CLSA wants to sponsor in the 1999/2000 session.

3. Sunset Process and Related Legislative Action (Possible Action)

Mr. Hopwood reported that the Sunset report had gone to print and will be available for distribution shortly. Staff must still determine the production costs before the report can be made available to the public.

Mr. Hopwood complimented Ms. Christenson and her staff for a job well done.

### **b. Enforcement**

1. Report on the December 17, 1998, Committee Meeting

Ms. Safran reported on the December 17, 1998, Enforcement Committee Meeting.

2. Approval of Rulemaking Process to Amend Board Rule 411 (Seal) (Possible Action)

MOTION: Ms. Safran/Mr. Foley moved to direct staff to begin the rulemaking process to amend Board Rule 411 as shown on Pages 39 and 40 of the Enforcement Committee agenda using the language for subdivisions (f) and (g) which would allow for the use of electronically-generated seals while prohibiting the use of electronically-generated signatures.

VOTE: 12-0, Motion carried.

3. Review of Delinquent Reinstatement Process (Possible Action)

Ms. Safran reported that the committee will have staff compile the responses already received from Board members and get responses from Ms. Safran, Ms. Lyon, and Dr. Chen. Staff will then come back to the committee at the February 25 meeting with several alternatives for addressing the delinquent reinstatement process.

**c. Examination/Qualifications**

1. Report on the December 17, 1998, Committee Meeting

Mr. Di Tomaso reported on the December 17, 1998, Examination/Qualifications Committee Meeting.

2. Request for Proposal (RFP) Bid Evaluation and Vendor Recommendation (Possible Action)

Mr. Di Tomaso informed the Board that the recommendation of a vendor for exam development services would be delayed until January. Several Board members and staff evaluating the proposals have requested an opportunity to interview the vendors. Mr. Di Tomaso reported that Board staff has permission from the Department of General Services and DCA's legal department to conduct interviews. The interviews will be held on January 15, 1999. The Evaluation Committee will release a notice of Intent to Award on January 19, 1999.

Mr. Di Tomaso also reported that the delay will move back the estimated contract approval date to sometime between February 9 and March 2, 1999.

3. Five-Year Waiver of the EIT Examination for College and University Faculty (Possible Action)

Mr. Di Tomaso reported that the October 1999 exam administration would be the final exam where faculty can have the EIT waived before taking the P.E. Practice Act exam. The Board even made accommodations to allow university faculty to take the P.E. exam at a separate location from other candidates; however, the Board did not receive any requests from university faculty to take advantage of the P.E. waiver or to take the exam at a special, separate location.

Mr. Di Tomaso reported that Board staff would draft a letter to be sent to universities informing them that the 5-year waiver is expiring and that all non-registered faculty are subject thereafter to Board regulations.

4.      Citizenship and Immigration Status Verification Regulations  
(Possible Action)

Mr. Di Tomaso reported that the Committee had chosen not to make any changes to the directive it had already given to proceed on schedule.

MOTION:      Ms. Safran/Ms. Hoffman moved to postpone any movement on this issue until the February 26, 1999, Board meeting when we will have direction from OAL.

VOTE:          A roll call vote was taken.

Mr. Brandow:	Aye
Dr. Chen:	Nay
Mr. Di Tomaso	Nay
Mr. Fairfield	Nay
Mr. Foley	Aye
Ms. Hoffman	Aye
Mr. Hopwood	Nay
Ms. Lyon	Aye
Ms. Safran	Aye
Mr. Vu	Nay
Vice President Shambeck	Aye
President Powell	Aye

7-5, Motion carried.

**d.      Administrative**

1.      Report on the December 17, 1998, Committee Meeting

Mr. Vu reported on the December 17, 1998, Administrative Committee Meeting.

2.      Cost Savings (Possible Action)

The Committee requested that staff prepare a detailed savings plan for consideration at the February 26, 1999, Board meeting.

3.      Legal Opinion on Subject Matter Experts (Possible Action)

Gary Duke wrote a letter to Professional Engineers in California Government that seems to have resolved their concerns. No action was taken.

4. Review and Update Board Operating Procedures (Possible Action)

MOTION: Mr. Vu/Mr. Di Tomaso moved to approve the changes as noticed to the Board Operating Procedures

VOTE: 12-0, Motion carried.

5. Emergency Plan Annual Review (Possible Action)

MOTION: Mr. Vu/Mr. Hopwood moved to approve the Public Emergency Response plan as amended with Debbie Thompson's and a second staff member's names, telephone and FAX numbers and their E-mail addresses added to the plan.

VOTE: 12-0, Motion carried.

6. Administrative Update (Possible Action)

- Fund Condition
- 1998/99 Budget
- Integrated Consumer Protection system (ICPS)
- Applicant Tracking System
- Outreach Efforts
  - a. Board Member Form
  - b. Reports

Mr. Vu reported that President Powell has requested that, for documentation purposes, Board members complete an outreach form for each instance of group and one-on-one contacts.

**16. APPROVAL OF BOARD TRAVEL (POSSIBLE ACTION)**

MOTION: Ms. Lyon/Mr. Hopwood moved to approve Vice President Shambeck's January trip to Clemson, South Carolina, to meet with the NCEES from January 21-24, 1999.

VOTE: 12-0, Motion carried.

**17. OTHER ITEMS NOT REQUIRING BOARD ACTION**

Mr. Fairfield posed the question "Does the California Board have the authority to create an historical record documenting 'what is' and 'what isn't' the practice of engineering?" Staff was asked to report to the Board on this subject at the February 26, 1999, Board meeting.

**18. ADJOURN**

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Next Board meeting: February 26, 1999, at The Handlery Hotel in San Diego